

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,273	KEITH-WOLFE, CAROL I.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert May	2875	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert May. (3) _____.

(2) Robert Sperry. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,15,16,46,51,52 and 55-57.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney agreed to an Examiner's amendment to amend Claims 1,42,51,52, to overcome antecedent objections stated in the prior office action, delete Claims 15-16 to overcome the objections to the Drawings. The reference number 15 will be replaced with 9 in Figures 3 and 3A to overcome the objections to the Drawings along with the appropriate corresponding changes in the specification. The applicant's attorney agreed to replace the word "regulate" with --affect-- in Claim 46. Claims 55 and 57 are corrected to address minor formality issues. The Examiner explained to the applicant's attorney that copendency was non-existent and therefore the claim for priority is improper. These changes are made in order to place the application in condition for allowance.